

P2 Metal Finishing Technologies Pilot Vendor Meeting Summary

September 21, 2000

Meeting Highlights

The ETV Metal Finishing Pollution Prevention Technologies (ETV-MF) Pilot held a vendor meeting on September 21, 2000, in Chicago, IL. Attendees included the EPA Pilot Manager, members of the ETV-MF Team, and six of the ten vendors who responded to a Request For Technologies (RFT) solicitation issued on May 12, 2000. A list of the attendees is included at the end of the meeting summary. The attendees were given a detailed presentation on the ETV-MF Program and the benefits and responsibilities of participation.

Donn Brown of Concurrent Technologies Corporation (CTC) opened the meeting by welcoming the vendors and explained that the purpose of the meeting was to describe the various pilot activities and documents in detail and answer any questions the vendors had. Alva Daniels (EPA) presented an overview of the ETV Program including goals, benefits, stakeholder roles, and ETV vision. Donn Brown presented the ETV-MF Pilot Program organization and management, including the ETV-MF Team consisting of CAI Resources, Inc., CAMP, Inc., Integrated Technologies, Inc., and Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center. Mr. Brown discussed the verification testing project management structure and the ETV-MF Quality Management Plan.

George Cushnie of CAI Resources presented an overview of the verification testing process, including the technology and test site selection process, test plans, and verification testing. Additionally, Mr. Cushnie discussed data analysis and report and statement preparation. On a project level, Mr. Cushnie presented an overview of the USFilter Silverback Verification Test, discussing milestones and vendor/test site contributions, while Dr. Eskamani of CAMP presented an overview of the lessons learned during verification testing of the BioClean Biological Degreasing Technology. Peter Gallerani of Integrated Technologies presented an overview of the ETV-MF generic verification protocol and explained that its purpose is to serve as a guide for developing the detailed test plan. Chris Start of Michigan Manufacturing Technology Center presented the format and content of the verification statements and reports and their planned dissemination methods. Gus Eskamani highlighted examples of vendor, metal finishing shop, and ETV-MF Team activities and responsibilities that will be required throughout the verification testing process. Donn Brown presented the current cost sharing policy, with elaboration on vendor in-kind contributions, metal finishing shop responsibilities, verification testing costs, and schedule of activities following the vendor meeting. The session concluded with the vendors asked to submit a letter of interest to the ETV-MF Program Manager by October 6, 2000, reaffirming their intent to participate in the EPA ETV-MF Program.

Questions and Answers

Summary of questions asked by the vendors during the question-and-answer sessions following each of the presentation topics:

Question: Is the project schedule commonly a year?

Answer: For the projects presently underway that has been the case. However, based on knowledge gained during the first year of testing, it is envisioned that the cycle time can be reduced for future projects.

Question: Who does the actual testing?

Answer: Testing is conducted by the ETV-MF Team. An accredited lab that is selected on a case-by-case basis performs sample analysis for water and other samples.

Question: Are the same sampling protocols used for all projects?

Answer: Each ETV-MF Project is different; therefore, sampling protocols are selected on a case-by-case basis. Rigorous QA/QC is practiced throughout each phase of an ETV-MF Project, and EPA methods are commonly referenced for test and sample methods.

Question: Are performance and costs of competing technologies compared in the report?

Answer: No. The performance of other technologies will not be compared in a standard verification report. Each standard verification project will focus on what was observed during verification testing.

Question: What happens if results of a verification testing project are not satisfactory?

Answer: Reports are published, regardless of results.

Question: Does the ETV-MF Program define the lines of communication in each test plan?

Answer: The ETV-MF Team will coordinate all verification testing activities and work closely with the vendors and test site in planning and conducting the verification.

Question: When is payment required from the vendor?

Answer: Payment is required from the vendor when the agreement and the test plan are approved and signed by the vendor.

Question: Who owns the report?

Answer: No one. The reports will be maintained by the EPA and ETV-MF Program on Internet web sites for access by the general public.

Question: How do technologies get prioritized?

Answer: ETV-MF Stakeholders are tasked with prioritizing the focus areas. A technology's ability to address a focus area results in its prioritization. This prioritization, in conjunction with the receipt of the vendor letter of intent and suitable test site identification, determines the order of testing.

The following vendors gave brief presentations on their technologies:

BASX Systems, LLC, David Stewart
Wastewater Engineers, Inc., Chuck Case

Vendor Meeting Handouts:

Meeting Agenda
EPA ETV Brochure
EPA ETV Quarterly Report, July 2000
ETV-MF Information Dissemination Methods
ETV-MF Generic Verification Protocol

LIST OF ATTENDEES

<u>Name</u>	<u>Company</u>
Donn Brown	CTC Dave Crotty MacDermid, Inc.
Chuck Case	Wastewater Engineers, Inc.
George Cushnie	CAI Resources, Inc.
Alva Daniels	US EPA
James Davis	Davis Technologies, Inc.
Gus Eskamani	CAMP, Inc.
Peter Gallerani	Integrated Technologies, Inc.
Rick Hall	KCH Services, Inc.
Scott Maurer	CTC
Bill McLay	QVF Process Systems, Inc.
Ray MtJoy	Lobo Liquids, LLC

Chris Start	Michiga Manufacturing Technology Center
David Stewart	BASX Systems, LLC
Ray Rivet	QVF Process Systems, Inc.
Jim Totter	<i>CTC</i>
Ian Tunncliffe	Lobo Liquids, LLC